

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,225	01/21/2000	Lori L. Carrigan	PO4355USOPHI1244	5584
27310	7590 01/17/2002			
PIONEER HI-BRED INTERNATIONAL INC. 7100 N.W. 62ND AVENUE P.O. BOX 1000			EXAMINER	
			MEHTA, ASHWIN D	
JOHNSTON, IA 50131		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1638	O <sub>1</sub>
			DATE MAILED: 01/17/2002	(

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/489,225	CARRIGAN, LORI L	
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Ashwin D. Mehta	1638	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 31 October 2001 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount she shortened statutory period for reply called the mail the mail the months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final of	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) 🛛 they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	<b>3</b> .
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-32</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disappr	oved by the Examin	ier.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
<del>_</del>			



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Failure to simplify: 112 and 102/103 issues remain. New matter: Basis for amendments reciting statistical significance is not clear .

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are duplicative of those previously submitted and addressed.

DAVID T. FOX
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 122

anour<del>ded.</del>